DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 057 SP 027 377

AUTHOR Gardiner, Dickinson
TITLE Control Ideology: Implications for Curriculum Change.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing Conference (Airlie, VA, October, 1980).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Sociology; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

This paper examines, through reviews of research and current literature, the teacher pupil control ideology within the social context of school. An orientation to curriculum change is presented, and the concept of pupil control ideology is introduced. Pupil control ideology is examined in relation to teacher orientation to curriculum change, and several implications developed from the pupil control perspective are presented and discussed. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267057

CONTROL IDEOLOGY: IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

by

Dickinson Gardiner

Paper Presented to the Journal of Curriculum
Theorizing Conference

Airlie, Virginia
October, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Gardiner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 027 377

CONTROL IDEOLOGY: IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE

"We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born . . ."

George Counts
"Progressive Education"
Volume 9, 1932, p. 263

It is the purpose of this paper to examine teacher pupil control ideology within the social context called school. An attempt will be made to:- 1) present an orientation to curriculum change; 2) introduce pupil control ideology; 3) examine pupil control ideology in relation to teacher orientation to curriculum change; and 4) present several implications developed from a pupil control perspective.

If we are to change from the traditional technocratic curriculum model which has long been dominate to a new sociology of curriculum movement, as labeled by Henry Giroux in "Toward a New Sociology of Curriculum", then it becomes imparitive to identify and analyze the control ideology of those who are at the end of the educational power structure--the classroom teacher.

Perhaps Robert Howsam, in 1967, placed the curriculum change problem in the proper perspective when he stated:

> Much of what we have been doing either seems to assume that no change in teacher behavior is involved or that change in the required direction would be easy. The fact is, however, that most of the recommended innovations are not simple and are not merely technical or organizational. Many involve a fundamental reorientation of teaching in directions that are alien to the teacher's inclinations. Even more often they require revision in the conception of the role of the teacher and modification of the teacher's self-image.[2]

Not only is there naivete in dealing with the above, but a literature search supports the notion that generally there is a failure to establish the teacher's present orientation toward curriculum change prior to attempting change in the teacher. As a result, the probability is that many innovative developments are rejected or subverted because they are incompatible with the orientation of the teachers.

Over the past four decades many approaches and/or strategies for effecting change in education have been developed and described by Miel,[3] Brickell,[4] Lawler,[5] Sand,[6] the Wingspread Workbook,[7] and others. All strategies for curriculum change involve people, and it is helpful to be able to identify the internal and external factors which create an individual's propensity toward accepting or resisting curriculum change. These factors may be part of the school-community environment, i.e., the external factors, or may lie within the attitudes and ideology of the teacher himself, i.e., the internal factors.

Research indicates that a critical external factor in the curriculum change process is the social structure of the school and its relationship to the teacher and what he perceives and values. For example, in 1957, Smith, Stanley, and Shores defined curriculum change as:

> . . . a process involving the personalities of parents, students, and teachers, the structure of the school system, and the patterns of personal and group relations among members of school and community. Curriculum change is social change.[8]

Social change in this context is perhaps best understood as " . . . alterations in a social group's essential attitudes and beliefs whereby new patterns or 'systems' emerge from present ones or essentially new ones are developed."[9] Smith, Stanley, and Shores also state,

> No less important in curriculum change is the social organization of the school. The school has a social structure which tends to shape the attitudes of teachers toward curriculum change as well as their perception of what is educationally possible and desirable.[10]

In Seymour Sarason's important work, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, he wrote,

> In trying to understand such a complicated human network as a school system, it is insufficient to characterize its organizational structure as more or less authoritarian. There can be many variations in organizational structure, and these variations are important in terms of the pattern of human functioning. Likewise similar organizational structures can be inhabited by different kinds of people, and this too is important. The interaction between structure and individuals must be our focus. Furthermore to make matters even more complicated, it is precisely this kind of interaction, occurring over long periods of time, that results in something we call a subculture, which is held together by a force not much different and no less powerful than the feelings of morality that bind our larger western culture.

Schools then must be understood as unique and complex entities just as the individuals and the subcultures within the school are unique and complex. We must realize that teachers may accept or resist change for many different reasons. In fact, part of the difficulty in identifying factors related to

the individual's proneness for change is that no typical resistance pattern has been clearly established. However, one aspect identified by Sugg in a study in which he sought to relate program development and the working patterns of principals is:

> . . . that teachers and principals tend to blame "things" -- inadequacies in building, equipment, supplies and related factors, and thereby, may not be getting at the more fundamental factors which block progress in program study and development.[12]

Zander also provided a clue when he suggested that resistance takes many forms, i.e., overt or oblique hostility, sloppy effort, fawning submissiveness, apathy, discouragement, indifference, cliques, or factions.[13]

There is a paucity of attitudinal studies dealing with teacher receptivity to change. Frymier, however, has provided some insight into the teacher's receptivity to curriculum change.

> The point is, even though many changes in education are legally possible, economically practical, administratively feasible, publicly acceptable, and experimentally defensible, they are not admissable, psychologically, into certain teacher's minds. And no matter what the weight of evidence or argument along the other lines, unless teachers both can and do receive the new idea into their own experiential field and give it meaning in terms of their own knowledge and feelings and skills, they cannot implement an innovation thoughtfully or effectively in any truly professional way.[14]

Several studies done in the 1960's attempted to identify teachers who are resistant to change. The Myers and Torrance study of classroom teachers identified as teachers who were resistant to change revealed several common personality characteristics important to this paper, 1) authoritarianism, 2) defensiveness, 3) insensitivity to pupils' needs, and 4) preoccupation with discipline.[15]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dempsey attempted to study both internal, within self, and external, outside of self, factors (barriers) that act to prevent desirable curriculum change. In his study of four hundred secondary school teachers, he found that those individuals who were not ready to change saw more total barriers to change as well as more external barriers.[16]

In support of the Dempsey study and using the "Dempsey Curriculum Barriers Questionnaire" and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E), Kerelejza found ". . . that closed-minded teachers identified a significantly greater number of barriers to curriculum change that originated within the self than did open-minded teachers.[17] These internal barriers were located in the attitudes, beliefs, and feelings of the teacher--the teacher's control ideology.

Pupil Control Ideology

In the early 1960's, Don Willower and Ron Jones at Pennsylvania State University focused on the school as a social system and did an intensive field study of a single junior high school for the purpose of generating hypotheses and developing ideas. They found that the dominant integrative theme of that school was pupil control.[18] Pupil control is a form of social control implying requirements for and restraints upon student-behavior so that order may be maintained. It is a critical element in group life within schools. The pupil control concept also seems to agree with Carlson's analysis of the school as a special type service organization similar to prisons and public mental hospitals.[19] These organizations have little control over client selection and clients have no choice in their participation in the organization; however, one must note that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

prisons and public mental hospitals are "total institutions" while schools are not.[20] Cressey,[21] and Powelson and Bendix,[22] found client control to be a significant variable in their studies of prisons and Scheff,[23] and Gilbert and Levinson[24] also found client control to be a significant variable in mental hospitals.

Following the study of a single junior high school and seeking to provide a way of thinking about educator orientations toward pupil control, Willower, Eidell, and Hoy adapted the typology of "custodialism" and "humanism" employed by Gilbert and Levinson in their study of mental hospital staff members.[25]

Using humanism and custodialism as "ideal types" Willower, et. al. developed a 20 item Likert-type instrument called the Pupil Control Ideology Form (PCI Form). The PCI Form was used to determine the extent to which individuals were "humanistic" or "custodial" in their pupil control ideology. Individuals with low scores on the PCI Form, those who have a "humanistic" pupil control ideology, have an accepting trustful view of pupils, strive for increased two-way communication, and minimize the difference between teacher status and student status. Individuals with high PCI Form scores, who are identified as having a "custodial" pupil control ideology, view punishment as a necessary form of control, stress the maintenance of order, and prefer an organization where the difference between teacher-pupil status is strictly maintained.

In the School and Pupil Control Ideology, Willower et. al. suggest that

> The rigid traditional school serves as a model for the custodial orientation. This kind of organization provides a highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order . . . The model of the humanistic orientation is the school conceived of as an educational community in which members learn through interaction and experience. Students' learning and behavior is viewed in psychological and sociological terms rather than moralistic terms.[25]

Willower, Eidell, and Hoy used the PCI Form for the first time with a population of 1,306 educators in an attempt to study the relationships of organizational position and socialization to pupil control ideology. The Rokeach E Scale was also completed by 973 of these same educators in an attempt to determine their open or closed mindedness and to relate this to their pupil control ideology. A sample of the findings from this study are: 1) principals and counselors were more humanistic than teachers (Willower, et. al. suggest that this may be due to the lack of direct classroom involvement with students); 2) as age increases and as years of teaching experience increases so does the level of custodialism; 3) male teachers were more custodial than female teachers. However, the degree of difference greatly lessened at the elementary level; and 4) closed minded teachers were significantly more custodial than open minded teachers ($< .001$).[27]

Pupil Control Ideology in Relation to Curriculum Change

Throughout his studies of the school as a social organization with a special emphasis on the teacher subculture, Willower found that status in the teacher subculture is directly related to pupil control and that teachers who find their status most threatened by students were the most control oriented. He felt that

AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

this concern with pupil control had the potential to be a focal point for resistance to any liberalizing curriculum change.

Subsequent research, using the PCI Form, by Jones and Blankenship,[28] Hoy and Blankenship,[29] Helsel,[30] Gardiner,[31] and others has supported the importance of the pupil control concept in the organizational life of schools. These studies clearly support Waller's,[32] Smith and Geoffrey,[33] and Silberman's[34] descriptive analysis of the school as a place where order and control and teacher dominance and student subordination is stressed.

Although Willower was concerned with educators and the curriculum change process early in the first decade of his pupil control studies,[35] and continued to voice his thoughts in several articles and a paper "The Teacher Subculture and Curriculum Change" presented at a Temple University Faculty Seminar in 1968, only three of the wide variety of over 75 investigators using the pupil control ideology concept have focused on teacher orientation to curriculum change.

In 1970, Jones and Blankenship, in their study of 68 biology teachers, found a significant correlation between pupil control ideology of teachers and implementation of teaching practices recommended by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. The BSCS program demands a "new" teacher role. The "new" role is no longer teacher and textbook oriented. It stresses cooperative interaction between pupils and teachers, independent thinking, and self-discovery. Jones and Blankenship found that the greater the use of recommended BSCS techniques, the more humanistic the teacher pupil control ideology.[36]

In 1972, Hoy and Blankenship stated the belief that certain personality factors and ideological orientations facilitate change. They found that "acceptors" of BSCS Biology were far more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than "rejectors" of the program.

They also found that "acceptors" of the program scored significantly higher than "rejectors" on four of the six personality scales that determine the capacity for independent thought and action on the Gough California Psychological Inventory.[37]

The above research suggests that individuals who have been identified as custodial through the use of the Pupil Control Ideology Form find it extremely difficult to change to a "new" teacher role, to become more humanistic, and that teachers identified by the PCI Form as humanistic have been willing to accept the "new" role. In other words, teachers who are identified as humanistic may find it less of a threat to their perceived status to change to the "new" role.

Gardiner, in his 1975 junior high/middle school study which examined the differences between and among teacher responses to the Pupil Control Ideology Form and the Runner Studies of Attitude Patterns (RSAP) and administrative judgments of teachers' potential resistance to curriculum change found: 1) teachers identified by administrative raters as potential acceptors of curriculum change tended to produce more "humanistic" scores (lower pupil control ideology form scores) than their counterparts who were identified as potential resistors of curriculum change; 2) female teachers were more

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

humanistic and males more custodial in ideology and; 3) a significant difference ($<.01$) in terms of teachers identified as humanistic (teachers scoring 24-48 on the PCI Form) and custodial (teachers scoring 56-80 on the PCI Form) between freedom-oriented and control-oriented teachers as identified by the RSAP.

The Runner Studies of Attitude Patterns Interview Form (1970 Revision) used in the Gardiner study is an instrument designed to describe the attitudinal framework within which a person interacts with ideas and individuals. A pattern, rather than a single score, is developed. Through interpretation of the attitude patterns, the 117 junior high/middle school teachers in the Gardiner study were identified as freedom or control-oriented, rigid, flexible, or overly-flexible individuals.

Kenyon Runner (1973) views the control-oriented person as one who emphasizes comfort over adventure and bases decisions on a consensually established authority. Specifically, this individual is a tradition-conscious, cautious person who respects authority and desires to live within the framework of his culture. On the other hand, the freedom-oriented person is a pleasure loving individual who enjoys exploring the world and its ideas, and who devotes time to interests appealing to the self.[38]

By using one instrument which identifies pupil control ideology and another which provides an attitude pattern the ability to predict one's proneness or resistance to change is increased. In the Gardiner study, by combining the PCI Form and the RSAP, and by using RSAP sub categories of rigid, flexible and overly flexible control and freedom-oriented individuals, further insight was

obtained into why some appear to resist change and others welcome it. For example, the rigid control-oriented and the rigid freedom-oriented individuals are equally unlikely to change but for different reasons. The rigid control-oriented individual is most easily described as self-righteous or authoritarian. He or she is completely and unalterably committed to a definite frame of reference and derives comfort and security from external reference points which he or she believes are without question and absolutely correct. In contrast the rigid freedom-oriented person derives his or her authority structure from within. Instead of being bound to a need for order, convenience, and established authority, the person is highly responsive to an inner urge for unrestricted self expression. It is extremely difficult for this individual to control and regulate his or her behavior to external demands.

Another interesting, although not significant finding of the Gardiner study was that 10.8 percent (four out of 37) of the teachers age 20-29 were identified as potential resistors of curriculum change, 33.3 percent of the teachers age 30-37, and 50 percent (5 out of 10) of the teachers 40 or over were identified by administrative raters as being potential resistors of curriculum change. All teachers identified as potential resistors scored higher (were more custodial) on the Pupil Control Ideology Form. This appears to indicate that the percentage of "custodial" teachers may increase as age increases, or perhaps this indicates that teachers who do not wish to become "custodial" (more control oriented) find other positions in education or leave the profession.[39] This finding is consistent with the findings of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, regarding the positive relationship between age and degree of custodialism.

The data from the population studied suggests that there is no substantial reason to doubt that differences exist between and among the ideology and attitude patterns of middle school and junior high school teachers identified as (a) potential accepters of curriculum change, and (b) potential resisters of curriculum change. This suggests the need to investigate more extensively the relationships between and among certain attitudinal and ideological characteristics of teachers and their reaction to curriculum change at the middle school/junior high school level and to examine further these relationships at other educational levels. Such research would have implications for curriculum change practices and for pre-service and in-service teacher education.

Implications

Given the pupil control focus of this paper, what then are some of the implications? Pupil control ideology has been conceptualized along a continum ranging from humanistic to custodial. Based upon the research cited a major implication is that those who are identified as having a humanistic pupil control ideology by the Willower, Eidell, and Hoy Pupil Control Ideology Form are likely to be amenable to curriculum change--especially if the change is tailored to their ideological structure. If the traditional curriculum model with its apparent priority on custodial control is ever to be replaced by a flexible humanistic paradigm than it will become imparitive to identify those teachers who are by their ideological stance potential advocates of such a change. That is true if we can make the assumption that ideology is reflected

in behavior, which may or may not be the case. Ones system of ideas, beliefs, and values may not be overtly acted out in a school setting where many intervening variables from the community and the school itself impact in complex ways. Perhaps we can say that ones pupil control ideology points toward potential classroom performance.

This suggests a number of questions regarding pre-service and in-service teacher education. Prior to student teaching should the attitude pattern and pupil control ideology of the students, the cooperating teachers, and the college supervisors be determined? Should a student teacher be placed with those individuals with whom his or her ideology and attitude pattern would not clash, or would the mere knowledge of the ideologies and attitude patterns of those working together serve to minimize conflict? Many pre-service and in-service teachers with whom I have worked have been not aware of their pupil control orientation and have been very interested in using the PCI Form and the RSAP to find out their pupil control ideology and attitude pattern. Does this knowing of where one stands assist the individual in the change process? Can curriculum change in a humanistic direction be successfully implemented among faculty members with diverse ideologies and attitude patterns or does the control-oriented teacher subculture of the school operating in conjunction with organizational, parental, and indeed student expectations of control socialize the neophyte teacher into a custodial manner of control ideology?

If the teacher subculture of the school is as consistent in nature as it appears from these studies, it would seem that the new teacher is either quickly socialized into a control oriented belief system (if they have not already

obtained this view from their own educational experiences and the society in which they live) or they will be regarded as deviates and not receive tenure. It would appear that the interaction between and among the larger society, the society of the school, and the belief systems of the teachers as influenced by the control ideology of the teacher subculture, have an ideological impact on the individual which is greater than the sum of the component parts. Implied here is the need for longitudinal studies beginning at the pre-service level which may assist us in determining how one's pupil control ideology is developed and put into classroom operation. Obviously, the relationship between personality structure and curriculum change is in need of intensive study.

Roy Helsel, in a 1971 study of 693 educators, found a direct relationship between custodialism as indicated by the PCI Form and traditionalism in value orientation.[40] Combining his findings with those of Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, and Gardiner, we can predict that older more experienced teachers will tend to be more custodial, traditional, and less willing to change than younger less experienced teachers. This implies that change in any direction not reinforcing their custodial ideological stance will be met with resistance. The more experienced older teachers view the proposed change as a threat to their perceived hard-won status, the more resistant they will be to change and the more custodial they will become in terms of their pupil control ideology. In fact, some teachers because of their ideology and attitude patterns apparently cannot change. We must realize that the change process is a very complex personal process that must be allowed to develop over time. Much that has been written about change appears to view teachers as passive artifacts--things to do something to--rather than

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

important actors in the change process. For schools to change the people within them must change. For society to change the people within the society must change. If society and the teacher subculture continue to value a custodial pupil control ideology, and as long as this manner of control provides means to the ends that the society seeks, then schools will continue to follow a technological model.

When, and only when, enough individuals admit in terms of their belief systems--how they view the world--that schools as we know them do not work, and are willing to desert from the established model, will a new model become visible. At present, we see through a glass, darkly, hopefully someday we will see face to face.

The Realist:	tells it the way it is
The Historian:	tells it the way it was
The Idealist:	tells it the way it should have been
The Humanist:	tells it the way Man must make it become

Burton Blatt
Exodus from Pandemonium
p. 169

FOOTNOTES

[1]Henry Giroux. "Toward a New Sociology of Curriculum." EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, Vol. 37, No. 3, December, 1979, p. 248.

[2]Robert Howsam. "Effecting Needed Changes in Education." DESIGNING EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE NO. 3, eds. E. Morphet and C. Ryan, (New York: Citation Press, 1967), p. 66.

[3]Alice Miel. CHANGING THE CURRICULUM - A SOCIAL PROCESS. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1946.

[4]Henry Brickell. ORGANIZING NEW YORK STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE. (Albany, New York: State Department of Education, 1961).

[5]Marcella Lawler. "Guidelines for Developing Strategies for Introducing Planned Curricular Innovations." STRATEGIES FOR PLANNED CURRICULAR INNOVATION, ed. Marcella Lawler, (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), pp. 13-47.

[6]Ole Sand. "Curriculum Change." THE CURRICULUM: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT. ed. Robert McClure, pp. 219-244.

[7]James Becker and Carole Hahn. WINGSPREAD WORKBOOK FOR CHANGE. (Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977).

[8]Othanel Smith, William Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores. FUNDAMENTALS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. Second edition, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957), p. 436.

[9]William K. Medlin, Finley Carpenter, and William M. Cave. EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CHANGE: A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL IN A TECHNICALLY DEVELOPING SOCIETY IN CENTRAL ASIA, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1965) p. 6, ED 003266.

[10]Smith, Stanley, and Shores. OB., cit., p. 439.

[11]Seymour B. Sarason. THE CULTURES OF THE SCHOOL AND THE PROBLEM OF CHANGE. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 8.

[12]Woodrow B. Sugg. "A Study of the Relationship Between Program Development and the Working Patterns of School Principals." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, Gainsville, 1955), p. 125.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[13]Alvin Zander. "Resistance to Change--Its Analysis and Prevention." THE PLANNING OF CHANGE. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 543.

[14]Jack Frymier. "Teachers: Not Will But Can They Change?" SFC NEWSLETTER, 6 (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1968), p. 2.

[15]R. E. Myers and Paul Torrance. "Can Teachers Encourage Creative Thinking?" EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, XIX (December, 1961), p. 159.

[16]Richard A. Dempsey. "An Analysis of Teachers' Expressed Judgments of Barriers to Curriculum Change in Relation to the Factor of Individual Readiness to Change." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963).

[17]Joan Kerelejza. "The Relationship of Closed and Open Mindedness to Factors that Selected Groups of Teachers Regard as Barriers to Curriculum Change." (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1967).

[18]Donald Willower and Ronald Jones. "When Pupil Control Becomes an Institutional Theme." PHI DELTA KAPPAN. 45 (November, 1963), pp. 107-109.

[19]Richard Carlson. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients." BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION Yearbook LXIII, Part II, (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1964), pp. 262-276.

[20]Erving Goffman. ASYLUMS. (New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 3-124.

[21]Donald Cressey. "Achievement of an Unstated Organizational Goal: An Observation of Prisons." THE PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, I (Fall, 1958) pp. 43-49.

[22]Harvey Powelson and Reinhard Bendix. "Psychiatry in Prison." PSYCHIATRY, XIV (February, 1951), pp. 73-86.

[23]Thomas Scheff. "Differential Displacement of Treatment Goals in a Mental Hospital." ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY. VII (March, 1954), pp. 208-217.

[24]Doris Gilbert and Daniel Levinson. " 'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology." THE PATIENT AND THE MENTAL HOSPITAL. Eds. M. Greenblatt, D. Levinson, and R. Williams, 1957, pp. 20-34.

[25]Donald Willower, Terry Eidell, and Wayne Hoy. THE SCHOOL AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY. (University Park, Pennsylvania: Administrative Committee on Research, The Pennsylvania State University, 1967), p. 5.

[26]Ibid., p. 5

[27]Ibid., p. 35

[28]Paul L. Jones and Jacob W. Blankenship. "A Correlation of Biology Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Teaching Practice." SCIENCE EDUCATION, 54 (July-September, 1970), pp. 263-265.

[29]Wayne K. Hoy and Jacob W. Blankenship. "A Comparison of the Ideological Orientations and Personality Characteristics of Teacher 'Acceptors' and 'Rejectors' of BSCS Biology." SCIENCE EDUCATION, 56 (January-March, 1972), pp. 71-72.

[30]A. Ray Helsel. "Value Orientation and Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Educators." EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION QUARTERLY, 7 (Winter, 1971), pp. 25-33.

[31]Dickinson E. Gardiner. "An Examination of the Differences Between and Among Teacher Responses to the Pupil Control Ideology Form and the Runner Studies of Attitude Patterns and Administrative Judgments of Teachers' Potential Resistance to Curriculum Change," unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1975.

[32]Willard Waller. THE SOCIOLOGY OF TEACHING. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1932).

[33]Louis M. Smith and William Geoffrey. THE COMPLEXITIES OF AN URBAN CLASSROOM (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 67

[34]Charles E. Silberman. CRISIS IN THE CLASSROOM. (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 122.

[35]Donald J. Willower. "Barriers to Change in Educational Organizations." THEORY INTO PRACTICE. 2 (December, 1963), pp. 257-263.

[36]Paul Jones and Jacob Blankenship, OP. CIT., p. 265.

[37]Wayne K. Hoy and Jacob Blankenship, OP. CIT., p. 74.

[38]Kenyon Runner. A THEORY OF PERSONS RUNNER STUDIES OF ATTITUDE PATTERNS. (San Diego, California: The Runner Associates, 1973), p. 4

[39]Dickinson Gardiner, OP. CIT., p. 84.

[40]Ray Helsel, OP. CIT., p. 28.